

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-16, and 18-21 have been amended. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1-11 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-11 and 19-21 have been amended to address the concerns raised in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 1, 12-13, and 17-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chung et al. (US 2005/0078947). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a non-transitory computer-readable storage medium comprising, *inter alia*, “a plurality of subtitle data items corresponding to the playback routes and configured to support a random search for a subtitle” (emphasis added). Claims 12 and 17 recite similar features. Applicants respectfully submit that Chung et al. does not disclose at least these features.

The Office Action cites the DSI of Chung et al. as allegedly disclosing the claimed “support[ing] a random search for a subtitle.” To the contrary, Chung et al. discloses that the “DSI contains information VOBU_VOB_IDN that specifies the identification (ID) number

VOB_ID of a related VOB to which a cell having the VOB_U belongs. Also, the DSI contains information regarding the ID number VOB_U_IDN of the cell that includes the VOB_U. Also, the DSI includes information C_ELTM that specifies time required to reproduce from a first video frame of the cell with the VOB_U to a first video frame of the VOB_U.” ¶ [0061] (emphasis added). The DSI of Chung et al. includes only identification numbers and reproduction time periods, and does not contain anything that would support a subtitle search, much less a random subtitle search. Applicants respectfully submit that Chung et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “a plurality of subtitle data items corresponding to the playback routes and configured to support a random search for a subtitle,” as recited in claims 1, 12, and 17.

Since Chung et al. does not disclose all of the features of claims 1, 12, and 17, claims 1, 12, and 17 are not anticipated by Chung et al. Claims 13, and 18-21 depend, respectively, from independent claims 1, 12, and 17, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 12-13, and 17-21 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

The statement that claims 14-16 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. Claims 14-16 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 14-16 depend from independent claim 12 and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, and on their own merits.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-16, and 18-21 have been further amended to correct grammatical and typographical errors unrelated to any rejection in the Office Action, and should not require further consideration or search.

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 1, 2010

By: /Rachael Lea Leventhal/
Rachael Lea Leventhal
Reg. No. 54,266
NSIP Law
1156 15th Street NW, Suite 603
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: (202) 429-0020

RLL/